

JUN 18 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCIEL LAGUNAS GREGORIO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71055

Agency No. A95-309-953

MEMORANDUM *

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 9, 2008 **

Before: REINHARDT, BERZON and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals’
 (“BIA”) denial of a second motion to reopen an earlier denial of cancellation of

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

removal. We review this decision for an abuse of discretion. *See Ray v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 582 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Singh v. Ashcroft*, 367 F.3d 1182, 1185 (9th Cir. 2004)).

We have reviewed petitioner's response to this court's April 7, 2008 order and we conclude that the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen. Petitioner's motion was number-barred, and the petitioner has not provided evidence to support an exception to the numerical limit on motions to reopen. *See* 8 U.S.C. §1229a(c)(7)(A); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). Accordingly, this petition for review is summarily denied because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard).

All pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.